



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
WESTERN DIVISION

FERMIN BRITO PALACIOS, ) Case No. CV 12-7667-DSF (MLG)  
Petitioner, ) ORDER DENYING CERTIFICATE OF  
v. ) APPEALABILITY  
GERALD JANDA, Warden, )  
Respondent. )  
\_\_\_\_\_  
)

Rule 11 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts requires the district court to issue or deny a certificate of appealability ("COA") when it enters a final order adverse to the petitioner.

Before a petitioner may appeal the Court's decision denying his petition, a COA must issue. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A); Fed. R. App. P. 22(b). The Court must either issue a COA indicating which issues satisfy the required showing or provide reasons why such a certificate should not issue. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(3); Fed. R. App. P. 22(b).

//

1       The court determines whether to issue or deny a COA pursuant to  
2 standards established in *Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322 (2003);  
3 *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473 (2000); and 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c). A  
4 COA may be issued only where there has been a "substantial showing  
5 of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253 (c) (2);  
6 *Miller-El*, 537 U.S. at 330. As part of that analysis, the Court must  
7 determine whether "reasonable jurists would find the district court's  
8 assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong." *Slack*,  
9 529 U.S. at 484, *See also Miller-El*, 537 U.S. at 338.

10       In *Silva v. Woodford*, 279 F.3d 825, 832-33 (9th Cir. 2002), the  
11 court noted that this amounts to a "modest standard". (Quoting  
12 *Lambright v. Stewart*, 220 F.3d 1022, 1025 (9th Cir. 2000)). Indeed,  
13 the standard for granting a COA has been characterized as  
14 "relatively low". *Beardlee v. Brown*, 393 F.3d 899, 901 (9th Cir.  
15 2004). A COA should issue when the claims presented are "adequate  
16 to deserve encouragement to proceed further." *Slack*, 529 U.S. at  
17 483-84, (quoting *Barefoot v. Estelle*, 463 U.S. 880, 893 (1983)); *see*  
18 *also Silva*, 279 F.3d at 833. If reasonable jurists could "debate"  
19 whether the petition could be resolved in a different manner, then  
20 the COA should issue. *Miller-El*, 537 U.S. at 330.

21       Under this standard of review, a COA will be denied. In denying  
22 the petition for writ of habeas corpus, the Court concluded, for the  
23 reasons stated in the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation,  
24 that Petitioner was not entitled to habeas corpus relief on his  
25 claims of constitutional error, because he had failed to show that  
26 the state court decision was contrary to, or involved an unreasonable  
27 application of, clearly established federal law or Supreme Court  
28 precedent. *Harrington v. Richter*, --- U.S. ---, 131 S.Ct. 770, 783-84

1 (2011). Petitioner cannot make a colorable claim that jurists of  
2 reason would find debatable or wrong the decision denying the  
3 petition. Thus, Petitioner is not entitled to a COA.

4 3/22/13

5 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

*Dale S. Fischer*

6  
7 \_\_\_\_\_  
8 Dale S. Fischer  
9 United States District Judge  
10  
11

Presented By:

*Marc L. Goldman*

12 \_\_\_\_\_  
13 Marc L. Goldman  
14 United States Magistrate Judge  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28